

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-21 in the application. In a previous response, the Applicants amended Claims 1, 8, 15, 17 and 18. In the present preliminary amendment, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8 15 and 17. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in paragraphs 24-26 of the original application. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,046,649 to Awater, *et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,326,926 to Shoobridge, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully disagree in view of the present amendment.

The Examiner recognizes that Awater fails to teach or suggest prohibiting interruption of a transmission of a second signal packet when a signal interpreter recognizes a first signal packet. To cure this deficiency of Awater, the Examiner cites Shoobridge. (*See* Final Rejection, page 3, relying on, for example, column 1, line 11, to column 4, line 6, of Shoobridge.) Shoobridge relates to operating a wireless LAN and a short-range wireless connection in the same frequency range. (*See* column 1, lines 6-9.) Shoobridge does not, however, provide any teaching or suggestion of prohibiting interruption of a transmission of a second signal packet, when a request to transmit a first signal packet is present, until the transmission of the second signal packet is complete as recited in amended independent Claim 8. On the contrary, Shoobridge is not even concerned with ensuring the completion of the transmission of a second signal packet upon detection of a request to transmit a first signal packet since Shoobridge proposes a system where Bluetooth enabled devices

and 802.11 enabled devices have antennas that are designed with directional properties to **minimize interference** between the two systems. (See Final Rejection, page 3, and column 2, lines 40-65. Emphasis added.)

Thus, unlike the invention as recited in Claim 8, Shoobridge proposes to minimize interferences of IEEE 802.11 and Bluetooth communications through the design of the directional properties of Bluetooth and 802.11 antennas. As such, the proposed system in Shoobridge does not even need to prohibit interruption of a transmission of a second signal packet when a request to transmit a first signal packet is present as recited in amended independent Claim 8. As noted above, the Examiner recognizes Awater does not even teach or suggest prohibiting interruption of a transmission of a second signal packet when a signal interpreter recognizes a first signal packet. As such, the cited combination of Awater and Shoobridge, fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 8 and Claims dependent thereon. Similarly, the cited combination of Awater and Shoobridge fails to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claims 1 and 15 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-21 and allow issuance thereof.

Furthermore, regarding dependent Claim 17, the Applicant fails to find where the cited combination discloses or suggests prohibiting interrupting transmission of the second signal packet by maintaining assertion of a Bluetooth transmission bus for a designated period of time after recognizing a request to transmit a first signal packet. The Examiner previously relied on Shoobridge to reject Claim 17 but the cited sections do not appear to disclose maintaining assertion of a Bluetooth transmission bus for a designated period of time after recognizing a request to

transmit a first signal packet. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate otherwise if the Examiner disagrees.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-21.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

*/J. Joel Justiss/*

J. Joel Justiss  
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: April 11, 2008

P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800